

CEQA REQUIRED FINDINGS – EXHIBIT D

CEQA REQUIRED FINDINGS FOR THE CHICAGO GRADE LANDFILL EXPANSION (STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NUMBER 2004071092)

The County of San Luis Obispo (hereinafter the “County”) hereby certifies the Chicago Grade Landfill Expansion Final Environmental Impact Report, State Clearinghouse Number 2004071092, which consists of the Draft EIR, the Responses to Comments on the Draft EIR, the Mitigation Monitoring/Reporting Program, these Findings of Fact, the Staff Report and any associated attachments (collectively referred to as the “Final EIR”), and finds that it has been completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resource Code Section 21000, et seq.) (“CEQA”) and that the County of San Luis Obispo has received, reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR, all hearings, and submissions of testimony from officials and Departments of the County, the applicant, the public and other municipalities and agencies.

Having received, reviewed and considered the foregoing information, as well as any and all information in the record, the County of San Luis Obispo hereby makes these Findings of Fact pursuant to, and in accordance with, Section 21081 of the Public Resource Code as follows:

BACKGROUND

The proposed project consists of several different components, each of which is described below.

Expansion of Disposal Area Footprint

The effective service life of the landfill, based on remaining capacity in the permitted modules, would end in about the year 2016. To extend the service life, the applicant is requesting that the permitted disposal area footprint be expanded from 38.44 acres to 82.74 acres, an increase of 44.30 acres. The proposed expansion area is comprised of proposed modules 6 and 7. Module 6 covers about 23.4 acres and module 7 about 20.9 acres of the total expansion area. Approval of the project would create capacity

for disposal of about 3,098,775 additional tons of waste. At a projected two percent annual growth in demand for disposal capacity, the service life of the landfill would be extended by about 29 years to the year 2045.

Module 6 would be constructed and filled first, with module 7 to follow. Module 6 would have a service life of about 15 years. Module 7 would have a service life of about 14 years.

Site development activities needed to prepare for placement of waste in modules 6 and 7 would follow a number of basic steps. First, excavations and grading would take place to establish the "floor" elevation of the new modules. The module floor is then prepared for construction of a liner and provisions for drainage and site access are made. The liner is constructed and placement of fill in the module can begin. Excavated materials would be stockpiled and reused as daily cover and ultimately as the final module cap. Construction of module 6 is estimated to require excavation of about 2,002,435 cubic yards of material. The final fill volume would be about 3,154,994 cubic yards of material. For module 7, about 1,119,024 cubic yards of material must be excavated and the final fill volume would be about 3,928,776 cubic yards. The slope of excavations for modules 6 and 7 would be 2:1. Once the modules are filled and closed, a final fill slope of 2.5:1 would be established. Ten to twelve-foot wide benches would be cut in the module slopes at intervals of 50 vertical feet.

To meet state agency regulatory requirements for environmental safeguards related to the proposed landfill expansion, the applicant plans to install new and expand existing safeguard systems. The new modules would include a liner system, leachate collection system, storm drainage collection and treatment system, and gas collection system consistent with existing requirements for existing permitted module 2 and consistent with requirements for the approved but as of yet unconstructed modules 3, 4, and 5.

New storm water collection and management improvements would be made. An expanded landfill gas collection system, which would consist of a series of collection pipes installed in the waste mass, would collect and direct landfill gas to the existing flaring unit. Four new landfill gas monitoring wells and three new water quality monitoring wells are planned.

5-48

Expansion of Facility Boundary

The applicant is proposing that the current permitted facility boundary be expanded to include the entire 188-acre parcel owned by Chicago Grade Landfill and Recycling LLC. Current permitted activities take place on only a portion of the entire 188-acre parcel. This action would enable the applicant greater flexibility in facilitating landfill activities by broadening the area in which support activities can be conducted and/or infrastructure and facility improvements could be made. The proposed facility boundary expansion would not enable the applicant to place waste outside of the existing disposal footprint area or outside the proposed expansion area footprint.

Lowering of Permitted Solid Waste Placement Elevation/Filling of Ridgelines

The applicant is proposing two actions that are intended to reduce the visibility of the permitted landfill and the proposed expansion area from public and private viewpoints, respectively. First, the permitted maximum height of the existing landfill would be reduced from 1,400 to 1,360 feet above mean sea level. Existing permitted module 5 would reach 1,400 feet. By reducing the permitted height of the landfill to 1,360 feet, the applicant would effectively be eliminating module 5 from the existing landfill operating plan. Module 5 would only be eliminated if the proposed landfill expansion were approved. Second, the applicant proposes to place fill material in two low points along ridges located at the northern boundary of proposed module 6 and along the northeastern boundary of modules 6 and 7. The purpose is to better screen landfill operations within the proposed expansion area from view from off-site public and private viewpoints. The fill would also help to screen existing permitted operations from view.

Additional Landfill Buffer

The applicant plans to create an additional 100-foot wide buffer at the periphery of the proposed expansion area. In combination with the existing 500-foot buffer defined on surrounding properties, the new buffer would increase the total buffer between the proposed expansion area and the nearest adjacent residences to a minimum of 600 feet. No landfilling would take place within the 100-foot buffer, but ancillary infrastructure, such as landfill gas monitoring wells are proposed within it.

5-49

No Change in Currently Permitted Daily Peak/Annual Waste Tonnage or Peak Daily Vehicle Trips

If the proposed project were approved, existing operations at the landfill as currently permitted would continue. Under the current solid waste facility permit (SWFP), a peak daily volume of 500 tons of waste may be accepted and a total annual volume of 100,000 tons of waste may be accepted at the facility. The peak daily number of vehicle trips allowed into the site (not including employees or maintenance vehicles) is 240 on Sunday and weekdays and 280 on Saturday (480 and 560 total vehicle trips in and out, respectively). The applicant is not requesting modifications to the existing SWFP to enable increases in permitted peak daily waste tonnage, annual waste tonnage, or the number of daily peak vehicle trips.

No changes to existing operations at the landfill are allowed if the proposed project is approved. Existing operations are described in section 1.2 (of the Final EIR), Existing Setting and Conditions.

Access to the landfill would continue to be via Homestead Road.

Required Approvals

The proposed project involves the following approvals: Certification of the Final EIR for the proposed Chicago Grade Landfill Expansion (San Luis Obispo County); approval of a mitigation monitoring program for the proposed Chicago Grade Landfill expansion (San Luis Obispo County); approval of a Development Plan (San Luis Obispo County); modification of the existing SWFP (CIWMB); and Water Quality Certification and Storm Water Discharge Permits (CCRWQCB).

State agencies are important in the landfill expansion approval process. The California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) and the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (CCRWQCB) are the main state agencies that regulate landfills. The CIWMB has the lead responsibility for reviewing, permitting, and monitoring landfill expansion projects. Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations identifies the roles and responsibilities of the CIWMB in this capacity. Title 27 includes detailed procedures and standards for environmental protection that applicants who request approval of a SWFP from the CIWMB must follow. The CIWMB will not approve a landfill project unless the applicant satisfies the requirements of Title 27 and satisfies all conditions required for approval of a SWFP. The CIWMB also has the authority to

5-50

legally force a landfill operator to rectify any action or activity that does not comply with Title 27.

The CCRWQCB has statutory responsibility for reviewing, monitoring, and enforcing standards to minimize potential landfill impacts on surface and groundwater quality. The CCRWQCB authority is through Title 27 and the Code of Federal Regulations, Title 40. A landfill operator must be compliant with a set of waste discharge requirements (WDRs) that are issued by the CCRWQCB. The WDRs specify how a landfill is to be constructed, operated, and maintained to avoid impacts on water quality and public health and safety. The CCRWQCB also has legal authority to force a landfill operator to rectify any action or activity that does not comply with CCRWQCB standards or conditions.

Other agencies may also be involved in permitting activities related to a landfill expansion. For example, the SLOAPCD also regulates the existing landfill gas flaring system at the Chicago Grade Landfill. The SLOAPCD's goal is to ensure that impacts on air quality from the system are minimized.

Local agencies such as a county typically defer to the CIWMB and CCRWQCB as the primary regulators of landfill projects, and may defer to regional or local agencies such as the SLOAPCD to regulate specific elements of a landfill project. CEQA Guidelines section 15091 (a)(1) on Findings basically states that a lead agency, in this case San Luis Obispo County, may make a finding for significant environmental effects of a project that mitigation of such impacts is the responsibility and jurisdiction of another agency (i.e. the CIWMB or CCRWQB) and not the agency making the finding – the County. Mitigation for significant environmental effects must have been adopted by the other agency or can and should be adopted by the other agency in order for the County to make this finding.

The Final EIR has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (CEQA) as amended (Public Resources Code Section 21000, et. seq.). This Final EIR is intended to address all of the impacts, mitigation measures, project alternatives, etc. associated with the proposed project. An Initial Study for the project was prepared by the County of San Luis Obispo and a Notice of Preparation (NOP) for an EIR was distributed to local Responsible and Trustee Agencies, the State Clearinghouse and other interested parties between July 16, 2004 and August 16, 2004. Various agencies and individuals provided written comments within the State-mandated 30-day public review period for the NOP.

Upon the completion of the County's review of the administrative draft and draft EIR, copies or notification of availability of the Draft EIR were forwarded to all Responsible/Trustee Agencies and interested groups and individuals. As was also the case for the Notice of Preparation, the Draft EIR was forwarded to the State Clearinghouse for distribution to and review by various involved State agencies. The Draft EIR was circulated for public review for 45 days during the period from August 5, 2005 to September 19, 2005 and public comments were received. The public review period was extended to October 19, 2005 in response to a comment made by the public. A Response to Comments package was then prepared which presented all written comments received on the Draft EIR and responses to the comments.

The Final EIR has been prepared for the County of San Luis Obispo in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), as amended, and County Guidelines for the Implementation of CEQA. Pursuant to California Public Resources Code 21082.1, the County of San Luis Obispo has independently reviewed and analyzed the information contained in the Final Environmental Impact Report. The conclusions and discussions contained herein reflect the independent judgment of the County of San Luis Obispo as to those issues at the time of publication.

THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

An Initial Study for the proposed project was prepared by the County of San Luis Obispo in May, 2004, which identified potential significant environmental impacts attributable to the proposed project. These potential impact areas include aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, water, noise, public services, and transportation and circulation. The issue of agriculture resources was subsequently added as a potential impact area. In addition, the State CEQA Guidelines require analysis of Unavoidable Adverse Impacts, Project Alternatives, Growth Inducing Impacts, Cumulative Impacts, and provision of a Mitigation Monitoring/Reporting Program. As a result of the Initial Study, it was determined that the proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment and an EIR was required.

The Final EIR analyzed both project specific and cumulative effects of the proposed project. The Final EIR developed and identified a variety of mitigation measures to minimize, reduce, avoid or compensate for the potential adverse effects of the proposed project. The Final EIR discussed a number of potential alternatives to the

proposed project, including the: 1) the No Project Alternative; 2) Project Redesign; 3) Reduced Project; and 4) Alternative Project Location.

Public hearings will be held on the project proposal and its associated environmental impacts by the County of San Luis Obispo Planning Commission prior to the certification of the Final EIR.

The County of San Luis Obispo makes the following findings in adopting a Resolution certifying the Final EIR. Section 1 of these Findings contains the Statement of Overriding considerations. Section 2 discusses those potential environmental effects of the proposed project which have been mitigated to a level of insignificance. Section 3 discusses the potential environmental effects of the proposed project which were determined not to be significant. Section 4 discusses the significant unavoidable environmental effects of the proposed project which cannot be feasibly mitigated to a level of insignificance. Section 5 discusses the growth-inducing impacts of the proposed project. Section 6 discusses the alternatives to the proposed project discussed in the Final EIR. Section 7 discusses the Mitigation Monitoring/Reporting Program for the proposed project. Section 8 contains the required CEQA Sections 15091 and 15092 Findings. The findings set forth in each section are supported by substantial evidence in the administrative record of the proposed project. Exhibit A to these Findings contains the Mitigation Monitoring/Reporting Program for the proposed project.

SECTION 1 - STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

The Final EIR has identified and discussed significant effects which will occur as a result of the proposed Chicago Grade Landfill Expansion. With the implementation of the mitigation measures discussed in the Final EIR, these effects can be mitigated to a level of insignificance. No significant unavoidable impacts were identified. Therefore, a statement of overriding considerations is not required.

SECTION 2 - POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS WHICH HAVE BEEN MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF INSIGNIFICANCE

All Final EIR mitigation measures (as set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring Program attached as Exhibit A to these Findings) have been incorporated into the Conditions of Approval for the Chicago Grade Landfill Expansion.

5-53

The County has determined that these mitigation measures and conditions of approval will result in a substantial reduction of the following impacts which have been mitigated to a level of insignificance. The mitigation measures referred to below are contained within the Mitigation Monitoring Program which is attached as Exhibit A to these Findings.

A. Aesthetics

1. Impacts – Refer to Final EIR pages 2-1 through 2-19.
2. Mitigations – Refer to Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measure 1 as set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring Program attached as Exhibit A to these Findings.
3. Findings –
 - a. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the Final EIR.
4. Supportive Evidence – The proposed project would result in a lowering of the existing permitted landfill height by removing approved module 5 from the landfill operating plan. The permitted height would be reduced from 1,400 feet to 1,360 feet. The maximum height of the proposed expansion modules is 1,304 feet. The expansion area would largely be screened from view by the existing landfill modules once they are filled.

To help screen the existing and proposed modules from view from adjacent public and private viewpoints, the applicant is proposing to place fill in the low points of ridges along the northern and eastern sides of the proposed expansion area. Revegetation of both the proposed expansion area modules, as required per state regulatory requirements, and revegetation of the proposed fill areas will serve to help blend areas modified by the project into the overall visual setting. These actions will reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

The proposed project does not require the use of nighttime lighting.

With the incorporation of mitigation measures as set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring Program attached as Exhibit A to these Findings, the potentially significant visual

impacts associated with the proposed project will be reduced to a level of insignificance.

B. Air Quality

1. Impacts – Refer to Final EIR pages 2-19 through 2-39.
2. Mitigations – Refer to Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures 2, 3, and 4 as set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring Program attached as Exhibit A to these Findings.
3. Findings –
 - a. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the Final EIR.
 - b. Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes can and should be adopted by such other agency.
4. Supportive Evidence – Temporary impacts would result from project construction activities. Air pollutants would be emitted by construction equipment and fugitive dust would be generated during grading and site preparation. PM10 emissions are projected to exceed the 2.5 tons per quarter Air Pollution Control District (APCD) threshold for this pollutant. However, mitigation measures are proposed to ensure compliance with the PM10 emissions standards and reduce generation of other pollutants.

The proposed project will extend the operating life of the landfill to the year 2045. Traffic that now travels to the landfill will continue to do so for another 29 years. The proposed project does not include a request to increase the peak number of vehicles that are permitted into the site on a daily basis. Therefore, the proposed project is not expected to result in increased traffic generation relative to existing operations. On-site placement, movement, and covering of waste by equipment operated by the Chicago Grade Landfill under existing conditions will continue function in the same capacity for another 29 years. Traffic and landfill equipment will generate a long-term source of air pollutants which will alter air quality within areas immediately adjacent to project facilities (local impacts) as well as air quality on a regional scale (regional impacts).

5-55

Because the proposed project will not result in an increase in traffic generation, localized carbon monoxide levels will not exceed any State or Federal standards. Regional long-term air quality impacts will result from development of the proposed project.

Pollutant emissions associated with the proposed project are not projected to exceed any of the Tier I or Tier II APCD thresholds of significance.

With the incorporation of mitigation measures as set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring Program attached as Exhibit A to these Findings, the potentially significant air quality impacts associated with the proposed project will be reduced to a level of insignificance.

C. Biological Resources

1. Impacts – Refer to Final EIR pages 2-39 to 2-47.
2. Mitigations – Refer to Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures 5 and 6 as set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring Program attached as Exhibit A to these Findings.
3. Findings –
 - a. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the Final EIR.
 - b. Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes can and should be adopted by such other agency.

5-56

4. **Supportive Evidence – Development of the proposed project will result in significant grading and in the loss of existing vegetation within the expansion area. The types of vegetation that would be lost are largely non-native ruderal (weedy) species. The expansion area has been degraded over time by grazing. No special status species of vegetation been identified within the expansion area. Further, the expansion area does not contain habitat for special status animal species. Concern does exist that the project could result in an influx of invasive species unless such species are eradicated. A mitigation measure is included in the Mitigation Monitoring Program to mitigate this potential impact to a less than significant level.**

The applicant did not submit detailed plans for placing fill in low points along ridges that border the north and eastern boundaries of the expansion as proposed. Operations to place the fill area could result in an impact on native oak trees or other plant species located adjacent to the footprint of the fill areas. A mitigation measure is included in the Final EIR and the Mitigation Monitoring Program to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

There will be no direct impacts to wetland resources due to project development. Alteration of hydrology has the potential to cause sedimentation of the intermittent streams located on the landfill property. However, mitigation measures described for Section A, Aesthetics and Section E, Geology and Soils, require erosion control plans, a storm water prevention plan, and revegetation plans. Implementation of these plans would reduce potential for erosion and sedimentation to a less than significant impact. The CCRWQCB will ensure through its permit process that these plans meet state requirements and that their implementation is monitored over the long term.

Development of the project will result in the incremental loss of habitat for common species of wildlife. Direct impacts will occur with conversion of the expansion area to a non-open space use, and indirect impacts will occur due to noise and increased human presence. However, due to the non-native character of the on-site vegetation and its historic use for grazing, the expansion area is considered to be of marginal value as wildlife habitat.

With the incorporation of mitigation measures as set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring Program attached as Exhibit A to these Findings, the potentially significant biological resources impacts associated with the proposed project will be reduced to a level of insignificance.

5-57

D. Cultural Resources

1. Impacts – Refer to Final EIR pages 2-48 to 2-50.
2. Mitigations – Refer to Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures 7 and 8 as set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring Program attached as Exhibit A to these Findings.
3. Findings –
 - a. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the Final EIR.
4. Supportive Evidence – Development of the proposed project will involve substantial grading to construct the new landfill modules.

The cultural resources report prepared for the project concludes that there is a lack of evidence of any other prehistoric and early historic resources within the expansion area. Therefore, direct impacts to cultural resources are not expected. Although no other significant cultural resources have been encountered in the project vicinity, there remains a potential that currently unknown cultural resources will be unearthed during project grading or construction.

With the incorporation of mitigation measures as set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring Program attached as Exhibit A to these Findings, the potentially significant cultural resources impacts associated with the proposed project will be reduced to a level of insignificance.

E. Geology and Soils

1. Impacts – Refer to Final EIR pages 2-50 to 2-64.
2. Mitigations – Refer to Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures 9 and 10 as set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring Program attached as Exhibit A to these Findings.
3. Findings –

- a. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the Final EIR.
 - b. Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes can and should be adopted by such other agency.
4. **Supportive Evidence –** Based on geologic studies performed for the proposed project, the landfill, ground displacement due to fault rupture is not a threat. However, the proposed project may be exposed to significant seismic shaking during its design life. Potential impacts on groundwater and surface water quality are possible in the event that shaking compromises the integrity of the environmental control systems (i.e. landfill liner, monitoring systems, etc.) that must be designed and implemented per CIWMB and CCRWQCB standards for a landfill facility. These two agencies are responsible for review of all engineering design and environmental control systems to ensure that they meet regulatory requirements that are applicable to the proposed project. These agencies must approve of the project design prior to the applicant receiving approval for a SWFP from the CIWMB and a Waste Discharge Requirements Permit from the CCRWQCB. Construction and implementation of the project consistent with the regulations is the responsibility of these agencies and provided this occurs, potential impacts on the structural integrity and function of the proposed project will be reduced to a less than significant level.

The expansion area is outside locations mapped by the APCD as containing naturally occurring asbestos.

The proposed project involves two sources of potential erosion and sedimentation impacts. Construction of the new modules will require substantial grading and earthwork which will expose soils to the erosive effects of water and wind. Placement of fill in the low points of adjacent ridges will also result in exposure of soils in these locations. Impacts on surface water quality from erosion and sedimentation of downstream intermittent streams could occur unless adequate erosion control measures are implemented.

With the incorporation of mitigation measures as set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring Program attached as Exhibit A to these Findings, the potentially significant geology and

soils impacts associated with the proposed project will be reduced to a level of insignificance.

F. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

1. Impacts – Refer to Final EIR pages 2-64 through 2-72.
2. Mitigations – No mitigation measures are required.
3. Findings –
 - a. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the Final EIR.
 - b. Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes can and should be adopted by such other agency.
4. Supportive Evidence – Hazard issues include: threats to groundwater and surface water quality in the event that seismic shaking compromises the integrity of the landfill liner causing a release of toxic leachate or in the event that groundwater monitoring or landfill gas monitoring wells fail, risk of explosion if landfill gas is improperly collected and handled, and wildland fire.

Release of hazardous substances, especially leachate, is minimized through landfill design and implementation of environmental controls. The process of landfill design, environmental control design and operation, and long-term monitoring of landfill practices is overseen by the CIWMB and the CCRWQCB. The applicant will be required to prepare design, operations, and monitoring plans that are reviewed for adequacy and consistency with state regulatory requirements for landfills. All design, operations, and monitoring requirements must be complete to the satisfaction of these agencies prior to the CIWMB's issuance of a revised Solid Waste Facilities Permit. The risk of hazardous substance release or explosion is reduced to a less than significant level through the CIWMB and CCRWQCB review and permitting processes.

The proposed project would not interfere with an existing emergency response plan. However, the existing *Emergency Response and Site Safety Plan* in place at the landfill will need to be modified to incorporate the landfill expansion area requirements. A modified plan must be prepared by the applicant and reviewed and approved by the

CIWMB for adequacy prior to CIWMB approval of a revised Solid Waste Facilities Permit.

The proposed expansion area is located within a high fire hazard area. A fire could expose workers and landfill improvements to related hazards. As discussed below in Section I, Public Services, the applicant will be required to prepare a fire safety plan for review and approval by the California Division of Forestry (mitigation measure 12 in the Mitigation Monitoring Program). Completion of the plan would reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level.

With the incorporation of mitigation measures as set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring Program attached as Exhibit A to these Findings and review and approval of the landfill design, operations, and monitoring programs by the CIWMB and CCRWQCB as required per state regulatory standards, the potentially significant hazards and hazardous substances impacts associated with the proposed project will be reduced to a level of insignificance.

G. Water

1. Impacts – Refer to Final EIR pages 2-72 to 2-77.
2. Mitigations – No mitigation measures are required
3. Findings –
 - a. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the Final EIR.
 - b. Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes can and should be adopted by such other agency.

4. **Supportive Evidence – Project-related construction activities will require the use of water for grading (dust control) and other functions. Water will also be required during the project operational service life of 29 years, also for dust suppression on haul roads and at the working face of the active landfill module. Ancillary demand from administrative and maintenance functions will also be extended for 29 years. Under existing conditions, water is obtained from wells located within the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin. The proposed project will not result in an increase in demand above current levels as project operations would remain unchanged from existing conditions. The proposed project's contribution to cumulative groundwater demand in the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin is estimated at about 22 acre-feet per year or about .02 percent of total projected build out demand within the groundwater basin under a worse-case demand scenario. Uncertainty in projections of municipal build out demand and much more importantly, agricultural demand, will have dramatically greater implications for whether the basin will be in potential overdraft in the future than does the minor continued demand that would result from the proposed project.**

The proposed project has the potential to degrade water quality in downstream intermittent streams that traverse the landfill property. Exposure of soils during to the erosive effects of rain and wind during module construction and during landfill operations (i.e. exposure of stockpiled soiled used for daily cover) could result in erosion and deposition of sediments in stream channels. However, mitigation measures described above in Section A, Aesthetics and in Section E, Geology and Soils, require erosion control plans, a storm water prevention plan, and revegetation plans. Implementation of these plans would reduce potential for erosion and sedimentation to a less than significant impact.

With the incorporation of mitigation measures as set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring Program attached as Exhibit A to these Findings, the potentially significant hazards and hazardous substances impacts associated with the proposed project will be reduced to a level of insignificance.

H. Noise

1. **Impacts – Refer to Final EIR pages 2-77 to 2-90.**
2. **Mitigations – Refer to Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measure 11 as set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring Program attached as Exhibit A to these Findings.**

3. Findings –

- a. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the Final EIR.

4. Supportive Evidence – Noise concerns are related to traffic noise on the local street network and to operational noise generated by continuing operations of the landfill both within and outside of the proposed expansion area. Local residents have expressed that landfill related noise, especially noise from vehicles that operate early in the morning, is a nuisance.

The current SWFP under which the landfill operates includes a limit on the peak daily volume of trips into and out of the landfill. The proposed project does not include a request to increase the current limit. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in an increase in traffic generation relative to existing conditions. Homestead Road provides the only direct access to the landfill. As such it carries the greatest volume of landfill bound traffic. The noise study prepared for the proposed project concluded that the existing traffic generated noise level at residences located closest to Homestead Road is 56 to 57 decibels (DNL). Under a worse-case scenario where the landfill's peak daily permitted trip volume into and out of the landfill was reached, noise levels on Homestead Road would increase by less than one decibel, or to 57 to 58 decibels DNL. Under both scenarios, noise levels would not exceed the County residential noise exposure standard of 60 decibels DNL. Given no anticipated change in landfill generated traffic over the extended 29 year service life of the landfill, the proposed project is not expected to have significant impacts on residential uses along Homestead Road or any other local roadway.

Potential long-term noise operational noise sources from the proposed project include heavy construction vehicles (considered long-term because the duration of construction of each module would be several years), on-site waste processing equipment such construction debris shredders, and heavy equipment such as graders that is used to manipulate waste and place daily cover. Noise from these sources would continue for 29 years beyond the year 2016, the estimated end of the service life of the existing landfill. Noise from existing daily operational activities does reach some residences and noise generated under post-project conditions would be expected to reach some residences. The intensity of the noise at its source, the elevation of the noise source, the elevation of residential noise receptors in the areas surrounding the landfill

property, and the variable topographical conditions within and outside the landfill boundary all influence the intensity of noise that reaches surrounding residences.

The finished elevation of the proposed modules 6 and 7 would be about 1,304 feet. This is lower than the permitted 1,400-foot finished elevation of the existing landfill. The applicant has agreed to reduce the permitted final elevation from 1,400 feet to 1,360 if the proposed project is approved. In either case, the finished elevation of the proposed expansion area will be lower than the finished elevation of the permitted landfill. The proposed finished elevation of modules 6 and 7 is also lower than some of the surrounding topographical features. The applicant's proposal to place fill in low points of adjacent ridgelines would also help to shield the transmission of noise to the nearest off-site residences until such time that the working elevation of the modules equals or exceeds the final elevation of the ridge fill.

The natural topographical features that partially surround the expansion area, the proposed ridge fill, and the landform created by final closure of the permitted landfill will help shield noise from surrounding residences. Further, the ground absorbs noise. The maximum hourly permitted noise levels at sensitive residential uses from stationary sources of noise are 50 dBA Leq during the hours from 7 a.m. to 10 p.m. and 45 dBA Leq during the remaining nighttime hours. The maximum exposure level at any time is 70 dBA Lmax and 65 dBA Lmax during the same respective periods of the day and night. The noise study conducted for the proposed project concluded that with consideration of topographical shielding and the absorptive effects of the ground, noise levels would not exceed County standards at any surrounding residences provided that either: 1) operation of the construction material grinder (the greatest source of stationary noise) is limited to the daytime hours when the exposure standard is 50 dBA, or 2) that the applicant's proposal to place ridge fill is implemented.

With the incorporation of the mitigation measure set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring Program attached as Exhibit A to these Findings, the potentially significant noise impacts associated with the proposed project will be reduced to a level of insignificance.

I. Public Services

1. Impacts – Refer to Final EIR pages 2-90 to 2-97.

2. Mitigations – Refer to Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures 12 and 13 as set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring Program attached as Exhibit A to these Findings.
3. Findings –
 - a. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the Final EIR.
 - b. Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes can and should be adopted by such other agency.
4. Supportive Evidence – With the extension of the service life of the landfill by 29 years, the proposed project would extend the duration of demand for police and fire protection services. Since a landfill use does not typically involve activities that result in demand for protective services, the proposed project is not expected to have a significant demand on these services. The applicant must comply with County standards for preparation of a fire safety plan (as specified in Mitigation Measure 13), as the expansion site is located in a high fire hazard area. Further, demand for fire protection services would be reduced through compliance with CIWMB regulatory requirements discussed above in Section F, Hazards that are designed to substantially reduce risk of explosion or fire from landfill gas.

The proposed project would extend the duration of time over which litter nuisance could occur. Residents living along local roadways in the vicinity of the landfill have expressed concern about litter and debris along the roadways. From time to time, the landfill operator (project applicant) has collected litter and refuse along the roadways. The litter typically blows or falls from vehicles that are transporting waste to the landfill. However, the problem remains. The applicant has agreed to regularly collect litter on local roadways as one action among others that are included in Mitigation Measure 13 in the Final EIR.

With the incorporation of the mitigation measure as set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring Program attached as Exhibit A to these Findings, the potentially significant litter nuisance impact associated with the proposed project will be reduced to a level of insignificance.

5-65

J. Transportation and Circulation

1. Impacts – Refer to Final EIR pages 2-97 through 2-110.
2. Mitigations – Refer to Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measure 14 as set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring Program attached as Exhibit A to these Findings.
3. Findings –
 - a. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the Final EIR.
4. Supportive Evidence – Transportation and circulation issues for the proposed project focused on safety concerns, especially along Homestead Road. Local residents have expressed concerns that vehicles traveling to and from the landfill create traffic, pedestrian, and bicycle safety hazards by traveling too fast, traveling on a narrow roadway (Homestead Road) with limited sight distance in several locations, and entering the opposing lane of traffic due to insufficient configuration of the landfill entrance.

The proposed project would extend the duration over which landfill traffic travels on local roadways by 29 years. It would not result in an increase in traffic on local roadways relative to existing conditions. Traffic volume into and out of the landfill is capped by the CIWMB under the applicant's current SWFP. The applicant is not requesting an increase in the existing daily peak number of trips into and out of the landfill. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in an increase in traffic generation that causes existing acceptable level of service on local roadways, specifically Homestead Road, to decline below County standards. Further, Homestead Road and its intersections with el Pomar Road and State Route 41 operate at an acceptable level of service under the cumulative development plus project traffic scenario.

The traffic report for the proposed project includes an analysis of safety conditions on Homestead Road using two analysis methodologies, study of crash data and a speed survey. These are the methodologies accepted by the County Department of Public Works for assessing traffic safety concerns. Based on the analyses, the traffic consultant found and the County Department of Public Works concurred that: 1) crash data do not indicate a traffic safety hazard anywhere along Homestead Road; and 2)

the posted speed limit of 35 miles per hour on Homestead Road is appropriate; posting of signs with a lower speed limit is not necessary or warranted based on the speed survey. Using these two accepted methodologies, it was concluded that potential safety impacts along Homestead Road are less than significant.

A range of possible safety enhancements along Homestead Road were considered as possible means to address concerns of local residents. The traffic consultant, in consultation with the County Department of Public Works, found that possible safety enhancements, such as flashing speed limit lights, additional signage, speed bumps, etc., would not result in significant improvements in traffic safety by slowing traffic or would not be feasible on a County through road. Other measures considered included relocating mail boxes along Homestead Road and installing bus turnouts; these were determined to be within the jurisdiction of other agencies.

The safety hazard caused by the configuration of the landfill entrance on Homestead Road has been addressed through a mitigation measure. The measure requires restructuring, as needed, of the entrance consistent with a set of design standards provided by the traffic consultant in consultation with the County Department of Public Works.

The proposed project will not have a significant effect on existing transit services as it will not create demand for such services.

With the incorporation of the mitigation measure as set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring Program attached as Exhibit A to these Findings, the potentially significant traffic safety hazard caused by the landfill entrance configuration will be reduced to a level of insignificance.

K. Agricultural Resources

1. Impacts – Refer to Final EIR pages 2-110 to 2-113.
2. Mitigations – Refer to Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measure 15 as set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring Program attached as Exhibit A to these Findings.
3. Findings —
 - a. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen certain significant environmental effects as identified in the Final EIR.

5.67

4. **Supportive Evidence – Land within which the proposed landfill expansion would occur is currently under a Williamson Act contract.** Expansion of a non-agricultural use onto land under a Williamson Act contract would be inconsistent with the contract and constitute a significant impact. The applicant has proposed to maintain the acreage currently under Williamson Act contract by substituting reclaimed land (to be used as grazing land) for acreage that would be removed from the contracted land through expansion of the landfill. Consultations with the California Department of Conservation, the state agency which administers the Williamson Act, consultations with the applicant, and an internal review of County Williamson Act procedures were conducted by County staff to determine the feasibility of the proposal. Staff has determined that the most appropriate solution to the issue is for the applicant to file a Partial Notice of Non-renewal which would, in ten years, enable the applicant to expand the landfill onto land that would be removed from the contract through the non-renewal process. The applicant would identify reclaimed land that if approved by the County, would be placed back into the Williamson Act contract as proposed so that the total acreage under contract would not change.

With the incorporation of the mitigation measure as set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring Program attached as Exhibit A to these Findings, the significant impact caused by the conflict with a Williamson Act contract will be reduced to a level of insignificance.

SECTION 3 - POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS WHICH HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED AS INSIGNIFICANT

Certain impacts analyzed in the Final EIR have been identified by the County as insignificant. These impacts are as follows:

A. Aesthetics

1. **Impacts – Refer to Final EIR pages 2-1 through 2-19.**
2. **Mitigations – No additional mitigation measures are proposed.**
3. **Findings – The potential impact from creation of a site that is incompatible with the existing landfill site and surrounding lands was found to be less than significant.**
4. **Supportive Evidence – See Section 2.A of these Findings.**

5-68

B. Air Quality

1. Impacts – Refer to Final EIR pages 2-19 through 2-39
2. Mitigations – No additional mitigation measures are proposed.
3. Findings – Potential impacts from exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentration, and the creation of or subsection of individuals to objectionable odors were found to be less than significant.
4. Supportive Evidence – See Section 2.B of these Findings

C. Biological Resources

1. Impacts – Refer to Final EIR pages 2-39 to 2-48.
2. Mitigations – No additional mitigation measures are proposed.
3. Findings – The potential impact from constraints to the movement of wildlife species was found to be a less than significant.
4. Supportive Evidence – see Section 2.C of these Findings.

D. Cultural Resources

1. Impacts – Refer to Final EIR pages 2-48 to 2-50.
2. Mitigations – No additional mitigation measures are proposed.
3. Findings – Potential impacts on historic resources and paleontological resources were found to be less than significant.
4. Supportive Evidence – see Section 2.D of these Findings.

E. Geology and Soils

1. Impacts – Refer to Final EIR pages 2-50 to 2-64.
2. Mitigations – No additional mitigation measures are proposed.
3. Findings – Potential impacts from exposure to unstable earth conditions, seismic hazards, hazards from expansive soils, and flood hazards, were found to be less than significant.

5-69

4. Supportive Evidence – see Section 2.E of these Findings.

F. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

1. Impacts – Refer to Final EIR pages 2-64 to 2-72.
2. Mitigations – No additional mitigation measures are proposed.
3. Findings – Potential impacts from risk of release of toxic substances and risk of explosion, and interference with an emergency response plan were found to be less than significant.
4. Supportive Evidence – see Section 2.F of these Findings.

G. Water

1. Impacts – Refer to Final EIR pages 2-72 to 2-77.
2. Mitigations – No additional mitigation measures are proposed.
3. Findings – Potential impacts from violation of water quality standards and change in the quality of groundwater were found to be less than significant.
4. Supportive Evidence – see Section 2.G of these Findings.

H. Noise

1. Impacts – Refer to Final EIR pages 2-77 to 2-90.
2. Mitigations – No additional mitigation measures are proposed.
3. Findings – Potential impacts from exposure of persons to severe noise or vibration and from a substantial permanent increase in noise levels were found to be less than significant.
4. Supportive Evidence – see Section 2.H of these Findings.

I. Public Services

1. Impacts – Refer to Final EIR pages 2-90 to 2-97.
2. Mitigations – No additional mitigation measures are proposed.

5-70

3. Findings – Potential impacts arising from effects on or need for new or altered public services were found to be less than significant.
4. Supportive Evidence – see Section 2.I of these Findings.

J. Transportation and Circulation

1. Impacts – Refer to Final EIR pages 2-97 to 2-110.
2. Mitigations – No additional mitigation measures are proposed.
3. Findings – Potential impacts from increased vehicle trips on the circulation system, reduction of level of service, creation of unsafe conditions, creation of traffic safety concerns, and conflicts with adopted policies and plans were found to be less than significant.
4. Supportive Evidence – see Section 2.J of these Findings.

K. Agricultural Resources

1. Impacts – Refer to Final EIR pages 2-110 to 2-113.
2. Mitigations – No additional mitigation measures are proposed.
3. Findings – Potential impacts from direct or indirect conversion of farmland were found to be less than significant.
4. Supportive Evidence – see Section 2.K of these Findings.

SECTION 4 - SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS WHICH CANNOT BE MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF INSIGNIFICANCE

The County of San Luis Obispo has determined that the proposed project would not result in significant unavoidable impacts.

SECTION 5 - GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The State CEQA Guidelines (Section 15126 (g)) require an EIR to discuss how a proposed project could directly or indirectly lead to economic, population or housing growth. A project may be growth-inducing if it removes obstacles or impediments to growth, taxes community service facilities or encourages other activities or sets

5-71

precedents which cause significant environmental effects. The potential growth-inducing impacts of the proposed project are discussed below in terms of these criteria.

Economic, Population or Housing Growth

The proposed project is not anticipated to induce economic, population, or housing growth. The proposed project would not result in a growth in employment as it is a continuation of an existing operation. It would not expand economic development beyond the level already provided by the existing operation. Since the proposed project does not involve construction of new housing and would not create a demand for new housing through significant population/employment growth, it would not induce housing growth.

Removal of an Impediment to Growth

The proposed project would not directly result in removal of an impediment to growth. It would not result in the expansion, extension, or improvements of public services, transportation facilities, or utility infrastructure that otherwise could represent an impediment to growth. The proposed project will enable residents in the vicinity and broader areas of the County to have access to solid waste disposal service for an additional 29 years. However, were the project to be denied, unavailability of more convenient access to solid waste disposal service is not likely to be a constraint to growth in the vicinity and the broader area serviced by the Chicago Grade Landfill. Lost capacity at the Chicago Grade Landfill would likely be replaced by directing solid waste to other landfills in the region and/or by development of new solid waste disposal capacity in an alternative location.

Impact on Community Service Facilities

The proposed project is not expected to significantly impact public services (police protection and fire protection) or utilities (natural gas/electricity, communication systems, water service, wastewater treatment and solid waste)

Precedent-Setting Effects

Precedent setting concerns are defined as the ability of a project to set an example of what can be achieved on parcels with similar land use designations and parcels of land situated in similar locations within the project area that have similar development opportunities and constraints.

The proposed project would enable the applicant to continue providing a unique service. It is highly unlikely that owners of land in the vicinity would be motivated to seek approvals for new landfills as a result of the proposed project. Siting of new landfills is a complex, time-intensive, expensive, and often controversial process – all of which are likely to be significant disincentives to property owners. Expansion of the existing permitted Chicago Grade Landfill can reasonably be expected to be less problematic than siting of a new landfill, as it involves only modifications to existing permits, operations, and infrastructure. Therefore, the proposed project is not considered to have precedent setting effects.

SECTION 6 - FINDINGS REGARDING ALTERNATIVES

Alternatives to the proposed project described in the Final Environmental Impact Report were considered. The alternatives discussed in the Final EIR constitute a reasonable range of potential options necessary to permit a reasoned choice. The Final EIR identified the No Project Alternative, Project Redesign – Change in On-Site Location, Reduced Project – Conversion to a Transfer Station, and Alternative Project Location as alternatives to the proposed project. The Final EIR does not identify any of the impacts of the proposed project as significant and unavoidable. The project alternatives, to varying degrees, may avoid or reduce significant impacts of the proposed project to a less than significant level. Conversely, one or more of the alternatives may result in significant impacts that have not been identified for the proposed project. Each of the project alternatives is discussed below.

A. No Project Alternative

Description of Alternative

The No Project Alternative would retain the project site in its present condition and land use. The project site is currently undeveloped land that has been disturbed in the past by grazing.

Comparison of Effects

The No Project Alternative would eliminate all of the environmental effects of the proposed project identified in the Final EIR. It is therefore, considered an “environmentally superior” alternative.

Findings

After comparing the relative impacts and benefits of the proposed project and the No Project Alternative, the County of San Luis Obispo did not select this Alternative. However, Conditions of Approval, monitored mitigation measures and features incorporated into the proposed project, as described in Sections 2 and 3 of these Findings, will substantially reduce the environmental effects of the proposed project.

Facts

The No Project Alternative fails to meet any of the project objectives as stated in the Final EIR in Section 1.4, Project Objectives. The No Project Alternative eliminates benefits associated with the proposed project, the most significant of which is to provide increased solid waste disposal capacity for residents within the County and beyond. For these reasons, the No Project Alternative was rejected.

B. Project Redesign Alternative – Change in On-Site Location of the Expansion Area

Description of the Alternative

The project redesign alternative examines changes in on-site location of proposed improvements or level of improvements that might be made to reduce otherwise significant impacts to a less than significant level. As previously noted, implementation of the proposed project is not expected to have effects that are substantially different than those associated with current permitted landfill activities. This is especially true because landfill projects are closely regulated by the CIWMB and CCRWQCB regardless of their location or character, and because the applicant is not requesting a modification of the existing SWFP to enable a change in existing operations that would be extended to the expansion area. The requirements of these state agencies serve as mitigation for a wide range of potential environmental impacts. Opportunities for reducing environmental effects of a landfill project by its redesign therefore largely focus on mitigating impacts that are specific to the site on which a landfill project is proposed.

Effects such as demand for public services, traffic and circulation, and traffic related noise and safety concerns would not be affected by a change in the on-site location of a proposed expansion project. Changes in the on-site location of proposed activities have the potential to affect aesthetics, biological resources, cultural resources, noise

conditions, and agricultural resources that are site specific. However, any proposal to relocate the proposed expansion area on-site may involve trade-offs regarding site specific impacts; relocating the expansion area to reduce one effect could intensify other effects.

Comparison of Effects

Aesthetic Resources. It does not appear that shifting the proposed project to other areas of the parcel would reduce its visibility. Visibility could actually increase as a new area may not be as screened from view from viewpoints located to the west by the higher, more westerly location of approved modules once they are filled to capacity and capped. Further, a shift in disposal location could require removal of some or all of the existing oak trees that are located in the southern and western portions of the parcel.

Air Quality: Air quality impacts from this alternative would be similar to those for the proposed project.

Cultural and Agricultural Resources: A reduction of potential impacts is not anticipated. The remainder of the landfill property has similar cultural resource sensitivity. Similarly, alternative locations within the landfill property are also on land within a Williamson Act contract – this conflict would remain.

Biological Resources: Relocation of the expansion area expansion into other areas of the parcel could increase the potential for impacts on biological resources (i.e. degradation/loss of oak woodland habitat located south of the existing disposal footprint). Overall, impacts from this alternative may be incrementally greater than for the proposed project.

Geology and Soils: Exposure to geologic hazards would be similar and potential for erosion and sedimentation would also be similar to the proposed project.

Hazards: Potential wildland fire hazards would be similar as the entire landfill property is located in a high wildland fire hazard area.

Water: This alternative would have similar potential impacts as the proposed project. However, it would be regulated in the same manner such that potential impacts on water resources would also be reduced to a less than significant level. Effects on groundwater availability would be similar as water demand would be similar.

Noise: Off-site transmission of noise generated by on-site activities does occur. The proposed expansion area is largely buffered from existing residential rural uses located to the north and east and south by intervening topographical features and is located further from most of these noise sensitive uses than would other possible expansion areas within the subject parcel. Therefore, it is possible that this alternative could have similar or more significant noise impacts than the proposed project.

Public Services: This alternative would not alter demand for public services relative to the proposed project.

Transportation and Circulation: Similar types of vehicles and the same number of average trips would be expected. This alternative would not reduce traffic impacts associated with the proposed project. Modification of the landfill entrance would still be required to mitigate related safety impacts.

Findings

After comparing the relative impacts and benefits of the proposed project and the Project Redesign Alternative, the County of San Luis Obispo did not select this Alternative. Conditions of Approval, monitored mitigation measures and features incorporated into the proposed project, as described in Sections 2 and 3 of these Findings, will substantially reduce the environmental effects of the proposed project.

Facts

The Project Redesign Alternative meets the project objectives in a manner similar to the proposed project. However, it does not appear to substantially reduce significance of any impacts identified for the proposed project and may, in some cases, increase the significance of impacts. For this reason, the Project Redesign Alternative does was rejected.

C. Reduced Project Alternative – Conversion of the Landfill to a Transfer Station Starting in 2016

Description of Alternative

A solid waste transfer station is used as a location for the general public (both commercial and non-commercial users) to drop off non-hazardous solid waste. The facility operator then reloads the waste and transports it to a landfill for permanent disposal at a landfill facility. The size and capacity of the transfer station is assumed to

5-7b

be the same as the transfer station in Santa Maria that is owned and operated by Chicago Grade Landfill and Recycling Inc. The site area is assumed to be about three acres. The facility would have a 500-ton per day capacity and an annual capacity of about 100,000 tons of waste.

The facility would operate in the same manner as most standard transfer facilities. Waste would be transported to the site by a variety of customers from commercial franchise haulers using large trucks to local residents using pick-up trucks or other smaller vehicles. All waste would be dumped on a concrete slab within a covered transfer building. From there, salvageable materials such as concrete and asphalt, wood, cardboard, etc., would be sorted out of the waste stream by facility employees and sold.

It is assumed that the type of vehicles delivering waste to the site would be similar to the type and number delivering waste to the Chicago Grade Landfill, namely about 15 percent larger trucks and 85 percent smaller two-wheeled vehicles. However, total traffic volumes for this alternative would be greater than for the proposed project. In addition to vehicles delivering waste to the transfer facility, large transfer trailer trucks with capacities of 20 tons of waste would be used to transport waste from the transfer station to a landfill. At capacity, a maximum of about 25 additional large trailer trucks per day would be distributed onto Homestead Road. Distribution of these trips would depend on the location of the landfill to which waste is transported. Local options for disposal could include the Paso Robles and/or Cold Canyon landfills, located about 12 miles to the north and 20 miles to the south, respectively.

It is assumed that the current SWFP peak daily vehicle trip limits of 240 trips into the facility on Sunday and weekdays and 280 trips into the facility on weekends Saturday would apply under this alternative. It is also assumed that the facility would be constructed within an area of the existing landfill property that has already been altered for existing activities, i.e. the tire shredding area.

Comparison of Effects

Aesthetic Resources: This alternative would have insignificant aesthetic impacts. The facility would be located within an already developed area and would not likely be visible from any public viewpoint. Undeveloped portions of the property owned by Chicago Grade Landfill and Recycling Inc. would not be altered.

Air Quality: Air quality impacts would be reduced. Construction and on-site operational activities that generate PM₁₀, the main pollutant of concern for the proposed project, would not take place. Cumulative impacts of the proposed project on air quality would be reduced as a result.

Cultural and Agricultural Resources: This alternative would reduce potential impacts on cultural resources as it would take place on a portion of the landfill property that has already been developed. No new disturbance of surface or subsurface soils in which buried cultural resources could be located would be necessary. No conflict with property in a Williamson Act contract would occur as no expansion onto such property would be necessary.

Biological Resources: No impacts to biological resources would occur. The facility would be placed in an existing developed area that has little if any biological resource value.

Geology and Soils: Erosion and sedimentation impacts would be significantly reduced as no excavation or grading of native soils would be necessary either during construction or operational phases of the project. Substantially less potential for surface or groundwater contamination from failed environmental control systems affected by seismic events.

Hazards: This alternative would not involve activities that present a greater fire hazard than would the proposed project.

Water: Potential surface and groundwater quality impacts from this alternative would be reduced relative to the proposed project. Little if any grading or surface soil disturbance would occur and no leachate generation would occur. Water demand from this alternative would likely be significantly reduced relative to the proposed project.

Noise: The increase in traffic generation could result in increased impact on residential uses bordering local roadways, especially Homestead Road. Non-traffic construction and operations phase noise are likely to be reduced relative to the proposed project as equipment needs are reduced. Transmission of noise off-site is likely to be reduced because the area in which noise generating activities is a very small percentage of the landfill property and is located at a lower elevation within the landfill property; surrounding hills and ridges topographical features would limit off-site noise transmission.

5-78

Public Services: Reduced demand for public services, namely fire protection services would occur, as the project would not result in an expansion of use in a high fire hazard area.

Transportation and Circulation: This alternative would have incrementally greater impacts on transportation and circulation. However, levels of service on local roadways would remain acceptable with the addition of about 25 truck trips per day. The traffic related safety concerns expressed by local residents could be heightened with an increase in large truck trips on Homestead Road. By retaining maximum peak daily vehicle trip limits (240 peak daily trips on Sunday and weekdays and 280 trips on Saturday) that now apply to the landfill operation, non-safety related worst-case traffic and circulation impacts from this alternative would be similar to those for the proposed project.

Findings

After comparing the relative impacts and benefits of the proposed project and the Reduced Project Alternative, the County of San Luis Obispo did not select this Alternative. While this alternative would reduce several of the significant impacts identified for the proposed project, it could also increase traffic safety concerns expressed by local residents. Further, by transferring waste to other locations, this alternative would simply displace potential impacts to the landfill or landfills that ultimately would receive the waste. Conditions of Approval, monitored mitigation measures and features incorporated into the proposed project, as described in Sections 2 and 3 of these Findings, will substantially reduce the environmental effects of the proposed project.

Facts

The Reduced Project Alternative may not meet the key project objective of postponing the need for another solid waste facility in the unincorporated portion of North San Luis Obispo County, as without the proposed project, capacity in one or more other landfills to which waste is diverted may be used more quickly, necessitating development of additional capacity in the future. Other objectives of the project would largely be met by this alternative. For this reason and the fact that this alternative may not provide a net reduction in significance of impacts identified for the proposed project, the Reduced Project Alternative was rejected.

5-179

D. Alternate Project Location

Description of Alternative

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f) (2) notes that a discussion of alternative locations is warranted if an alternative location can be found that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant environmental effects of the proposed project. Any discussion of an alternative project location presumes that an alternative location can be identified. An alternative location cannot be defined at this time. Therefore, the discussion of potential impacts of the project at an alternative location can be made only at a general level.

In the mid-1990s, the County initiated a study to identify possible alternative sites for new landfills. That effort was never completed because agreement could not be reached on one or more preferred alternative sites. Because landfill siting is complex, selection of any alternative could be considered speculative. The site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries and ability of the project applicant to acquire, control, or have access to the site are among the variables that would need to be known to determine whether a site is feasible as a potential alternative landfill location.

Comparison of Effects

At a general level of assessment, a new landfill located in an even more rural setting than the Chicago Grade Landfill would likely have fewer potential conflicts with adjacent land uses – specifically residential uses. Hence, concerns related to traffic and pedestrian/bicycle safety and noise that have been identified by local residents would probably be lessened. However, because an entirely new site would be developed, site specific aesthetic, biological, cultural, and water resources impacts could be equivalent or more significant than those associated with the proposed project. It is also likely that the economic costs of developing a new landfill would be significantly greater than providing expanded capacity at an existing facility.

The potential significance of seismic and other hazards that could compromise the integrity of landfill modules and/or environmental monitoring systems would likely be similar at an alternative location. Regulatory requirements of the CIWMB and CCRWQCB intended to mitigate a wide range of potential landfill related impacts will be

applied to the proposed landfill expansion. The same requirements would be applied to development of a new landfill at an alternative site.

Findings

The speculative nature of considering an alternative project site as feasible creates uncertainty about whether the Alternative Project Location Alternative is feasible. In this context, the County finds that on balance, with the implementation of Conditions of Approval and monitored mitigation measures, as described in Sections 2 and 3 of these Findings, that reduce the environmental effects of the proposed project to a less than significant level, the proposed project is environmentally superior to this alternative.

Facts

The Alternate Project Location Alternative may fail to meet the key project objective of postponing the need for another solid waste facility in the unincorporated portion of North San Luis Obispo County. Further, it is quite possible that this alternative could result in a broader range of significant impacts or increased significance of effects identified for the proposed project. For these reasons, the Alternative Land Uses were rejected

SECTION 7 - FINDINGS REGARDING MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM

Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code requires that when a public agency is making the findings required by State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a) (1), codified as Section 21081(a) of the Public Resources Code, the public agency shall adopt a reporting or monitoring program for the changes to the proposed project which it has adopted or made a condition of approval in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment.

The County of San Luis Obispo hereby finds and accepts that the Mitigation Monitoring Program, which is attached as Exhibit A to these Findings, meets the requirements of Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code by providing for the implementation and monitoring of measures intended to mitigate potential environmental impacts.

SECTION 8 - SECTION 15091 AND 15092 FINDINGS

Based on the foregoing findings and the information contained in the record, the County of San Luis Obispo has made one of more of the following findings with respect to the significant effects of the proposed project:

- a. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the Final Environmental Impact Report.
- b. Some changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes can and should be adopted by such other agency.

Based on the foregoing findings and the information contained in the record, and as conditioned by the foregoing findings:

- a. All significant effects on the environment due to the proposed project have been eliminated or substantially lessened where feasible as discussed in Sections 2 and 3 of these Findings.

5-82

Exhibit A to the Findings of Fact – Mitigation Monitoring Program

Mitigation Measure	Timing	Responsible Party
<p>1. The applicant shall prepare a complete engineered grading plan and revegetation plan for the proposed ridge fill. The grading plan must illustrate how the proposed fill will be contoured to blend in with existing adjacent topographical forms and features. A revegetation plan shall also be prepared using species that are consistent with adjacent grassland and scrub habitat types. The plan must be consistent with related LUC erosion control standards described in mitigation measures 8 and 9 with regard to biological resources and erosion control.</p> <p>The plans shall be subject to review and approval of the County Planning and Building Department.</p>	<p>The engineering and revegetation plans must be approved prior to the occurrence of the first of the following activities: (a) earth disturbance outside the 45.4 acre area of "Ongoing Waste Disposal and Recycling Operations" as shown on Exhibit A; (b) placement of liner outside the area of "Ongoing Waste Disposal and Recycling Operations" as shown on Exhibit A; or (c) placement of waste material outside approved Modules 1 through 4. The only exceptions to the above are grading for agricultural operations allowed by the County Grading Ordinance, grading required for the acquisition of daily cover for waste burial in Modules 1 through 4, or waste to be buried within approximately one acre of Module 7 adjacent to the boundary of Module 4 which lies within the Area of Ongoing Operations as shown on Exhibit A. The applicant shall provide an annual estimate of the anticipated location and volume of grading to occur under the exceptions. Grading activities shall be subject to monthly monitoring funded by the applicant. The applicant shall also provide records that indicate the location and volume of grading that has occurred under these exceptions in prior years in order to assist this monitoring.</p> <p>On-going monitoring for mitigation implementation is required through the duration of project operations.</p>	<p>County Planning and Building Department</p> <p>Grading plan shall be prepared by a registered professional engineer</p> <p>A qualified biologist shall prepare revegetation plan.</p>

5-83

Mitigation Measure	Timing	Responsible Party
<p>2. The applicant shall install a total of three (3) Diesel Oxidation Catalysts or other SLOAPCD approved best available control technology devices on the equipment that will be used to operate and construct the new landfill modules. The applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the SLOAPCD that such devices will be installed. The applicant shall contact the SLOAPCD to coordinate the implementation of this mitigation.</p>	<p>Best available control technologies shall be in place prior to the occurrence of the first of the following activities: (a) earth disturbance outside the 45.4 acre area of "Ongoing Waste Disposal and Recycling Operations" as shown on Exhibit A; (b) placement of liner outside the area of "Ongoing Waste Disposal and Recycling Operations" as shown on Exhibit A; or (c) placement of waste material outside approved Modules 1 through 4. The only exceptions to the above are grading for agricultural operations allowed by the County Grading Ordinance, grading required for the acquisition of daily cover for waste burial in Modules 1 through 4, or waste to be buried within approximately one acre of Module 7 adjacent to the boundary of Module 4 which lies within the Area of Ongoing Operations as shown on Exhibit A. The applicant shall provide an annual estimate of the anticipated location and volume of grading to occur under the exceptions. Grading activities shall be subject to monthly monitoring funded by the applicant. The applicant shall also provide records that indicate the location and volume of grading that has occurred under these exceptions in prior years in order to assist this monitoring.</p>	SLOAPCD
<p>3. The applicant shall pave the currently unpaved portion of the on-site haul road to a point as close as possible to the working area of modules 6 and 7. The applicant shall prepare a map of the segment of the haul road to be paved and present the map to the SLOAPCD for review and approval.</p>	<p>Paving of the on-site haul road shall be completed prior to the occurrence of the first of the following activities: (a) earth disturbance outside the 45.4 acre area of "Ongoing Waste Disposal and Recycling Operations" as shown on Exhibit A; (b) placement of liner outside the area of "Ongoing Waste Disposal and Recycling Operations" as shown on Exhibit A; or (c) placement of waste material outside approved Modules 1 through 4. The only exceptions to the above are grading for agricultural operations allowed by the County Grading</p>	SLOAPCD

5-84

Mitigation Measure	Timing	Responsible Party
	Ordinance, grading required for the acquisition of daily cover for waste burial in Modules 1 through 4, or waste to be buried within approximately one acre of Module 7 adjacent to the boundary of Module 4 which lies within the Area of Ongoing Operations as shown on Exhibit A. The applicant shall provide an annual estimate of the anticipated location and volume of grading to occur under the exceptions. Grading activities shall be subject to monthly monitoring funded by the applicant. The applicant shall also provide records that indicate the location and volume of grading that has occurred under these exceptions in prior years in order to assist this monitoring.	
<p>4. The applicant shall prepare a PM_{10} construction emissions mitigation plan to implement measures to reduce construction phase generation of PM_{10} during excavation, grading, soil movement, and stockpiling activities. The following measures shall be included in the PM_{10} construction emissions mitigation plan as required by the SLOAPCD. The applicant's plan must be submitted to the SLOAPCD for review and approval.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Reduce the amount of the disturbed area where possible; b. Use of water trucks or sprinkler systems in sufficient quantities to prevent airborne dust from leaving the site. Increased watering frequency would be required whenever wind speeds exceed 15 mph. Reclaimed (non-potable) 	<p>The mitigation plan must be reviewed and approved prior to the occurrence of the first of the following activities: (a) earth disturbance outside the 45.4 acre area of "Ongoing Waste Disposal and Recycling Operations" as shown on Exhibit A; (b) placement of liner outside the area of "Ongoing Waste Disposal and Recycling Operations" as shown on Exhibit A; or (c) placement of waste material outside approved Modules 1 through 4. The only exceptions to the above are grading for agricultural operations allowed by the County Grading Ordinance, grading required for the acquisition of daily cover for waste burial in Modules 1 through 4, or waste to be buried within approximately one acre of Module 7 adjacent to the boundary of Module 4 which lies within the Area of Ongoing Operations as shown on Exhibit A. The applicant shall provide an annual estimate of the anticipated location and volume of grading to occur under the exceptions. Grading activities shall be subject to monthly monitoring funded by the applicant. The applicant shall also provide records that indicate the</p>	SLOAPCD

5-85

Mitigation Measure	Timing	Responsible Party
<p>water should be used whenever possible;</p> <p>c. All dirt stockpiles should be sprayed daily as needed;</p> <p>d. Permanent dust control measures identified in the approved project revegetation and landscape plans should be implemented as soon as possible following completion of any soil disturbing activities;</p> <p>e. Exposed ground areas that are planned to be reworked at dates greater than one month after initial grading should be sown with a fast-germinating native grass seed and watered until vegetation established;</p> <p>f. All disturbed soil areas not subject to revegetation should be stabilized using approved chemical soil binders, jute netting, or other methods approved in advance by the SLOAPCD;</p> <p>g. All roadways, driveways, sidewalks, etc. to be paved should be completed as soon as possible. In addition, building pads should be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used;</p> <p>h. Vehicle speed for all construction vehicles shall not exceed 15 mph on any unpaved surface at the site;</p>	<p>location and volume of grading that has occurred under these exceptions in prior years in order to assist this monitoring.</p> <p>On-going monitoring for mitigation implementation is required through the duration of project operations.</p>	

5-86

Mitigation Measure	Timing	Responsible Party
<p>i. All trucks hauling soil or other loose material off-site should cover the material or maintain at least two feet of freeboard in accordance with California Vehicle Code (CVC) Section 23114; and</p> <p>j. Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto streets, or was off trucks and equipment leaving the site; and</p> <p>k. Sweep streets at the end of the day if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent paved roads. Water sweepers with reclaimed water should be used where feasible.</p> <p>The applicant shall meet with the SLOAPCD prior to initiation of construction activities to review project impacts and develop a plan for mitigation. The plan shall consist of actions listed in items "a" through "k" above or others as feasible. The applicant may propose alternative measures for review and approval by the SLOAPCD.</p>		
<p>5. A qualified biologist shall survey areas within the footprint of the proposed ridge fill locations, access roads, and staging areas that may be affected by vehicles or heavy equipment during the placement of the proposed ridge fill for special status species and protected trees. If special status species or protected trees are located during the</p>	<p>Action plans must be reviewed and approved prior to the occurrence of the first of the following activities: (a) earth disturbance outside the 45.4 acre area of "Ongoing Waste Disposal and Recycling Operations" as shown on Exhibit A; (b) placement of liner outside the area of "Ongoing Waste Disposal and Recycling Operations" as shown on Exhibit A; or (c) placement of waste material outside approved Modules 1 through 4. The only</p>	<p>County Planning and Building Department</p> <p>Biological assessments to be conducted by qualified professionals approved by the County</p>

5-87

Mitigation Measure	Timing	Responsible Party
<p>survey: 1) the ridge fill must be redesigned to avoid the species and/or habitat and protected trees, or 2) the applicant will follow the required County, CDFG, or USFWS mitigation as appropriate for impacts to special status species and protected trees. Consultation with CDFG or USFWS may be required. Results of the survey, proposed mitigation measures, and proposed mitigation implementation actions must be reviewed and approved by the County Planning and Building Department.</p>	<p>exceptions to the above are grading for agricultural operations allowed by the County Grading Ordinance, grading required for the acquisition of daily cover for waste burial in Modules 1 through 4, or waste to be buried within approximately one acre of Module 7 adjacent to the boundary of Module 4 which lies within the Area of Ongoing Operations as shown on Exhibit A. The applicant shall provide an annual estimate of the anticipated location and volume of grading to occur under the exceptions. Grading activities shall be subject to monthly monitoring funded by the applicant. The applicant shall also provide records that indicate the location and volume of grading that has occurred under these exceptions in prior years in order to assist this monitoring.</p> <p>On-going monitoring for mitigation implementation is required through the duration of project operations.</p>	<p>Consultation with CDFG or USFWS may be required</p>
<p>6. In order to prevent the spread of invasive non-native species, the following shall be included in the erosion control and revegetation plans described in mitigation measure #1 and in mitigation measure #9.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. An eradication plan for plants listed in the Exotic Pest Plants of Greatest Ecological Concern in California (CalPPC October 1999) and currently growing on the project site; b. Use of plants listed in the County brochure Exotic Pest Plants of Greatest Ecological Concern in California shall be prohibited; and 	<p>Plans are subject to review and approval prior to the occurrence of the first of the following activities: (a) earth disturbance outside the 45.4 acre area of "Ongoing Waste Disposal and Recycling Operations" as shown on Exhibit A; (b) placement of liner outside the area of "Ongoing Waste Disposal and Recycling Operations" as shown on Exhibit A; or (c) placement of waste material outside approved Modules 1 through 4. The only exceptions to the above are grading for agricultural operations allowed by the County Grading Ordinance, grading required for the acquisition of daily cover for waste burial in Modules 1 through 4, or waste to be buried within approximately one acre of Module 7 adjacent to the boundary of Module 4 which lies within the Area of Ongoing Operations as shown on Exhibit</p>	<p>County Planning and Building Department</p> <p>A qualified biologist shall prepare the revegetation plan.</p>

5-88

Mitigation Measure	Timing	Responsible Party
<p>c. Plant materials used in landscaping, erosion control, or habitat restoration shall consist of appropriate native California plants as identified by a qualified biologist.</p> <p>The erosion and revegetation plans shall be subject to review and approval of the County Planning and Building Department.</p>	<p>A. The applicant shall provide an annual estimate of the anticipated location and volume of grading to occur under the exceptions. Grading activities shall be subject to monthly monitoring funded by the applicant. The applicant shall also provide records that indicate the location and volume of grading that has occurred under these exceptions in prior years in order to assist this monitoring.</p> <p>On-going monitoring for mitigation implementation is required through the duration of project operations.</p>	
<p>7. If archaeological resources or human remains are unearthed during activities within modules 6 and 7, work shall be halted within 50 meters (165 feet) of the find until it can be investigated by a qualified professional archaeologist. In the event that human remains are unearthed or otherwise discovered, the County Coroner must be contacted so the finds can be properly identified and evaluated. If the find is determined to be significant, appropriate mitigation measures shall be formulated and implemented.</p>	<p>During construction.</p>	<p>County Planning and Building Department</p>
<p>8. The landfill operator shall train all landfill employees on the appropriate procedures to follow when/if archaeological resources are unearthed within the proposed expansion area. Each employee shall be trained: (a) at least once per year and (b) within the first two-weeks of accepting employment at the landfill. Each trainee employee shall sign a form that identifies the trainer, date of</p>	<p>Records subject to inspection by the County Planning and Building Department at any time</p>	<p>County Planning and Building Department</p>

5-89

Mitigation Measure	Timing	Responsible Party
<p>training, and that training was completed on the procedure, by whom, and the date of training. The most current form shall be kept on file for the duration of each employee's employment at the landfill. All existing employees shall be trained prior to issuance of a revised SWFP. The forms shall be subject to inspection by the County Department of Building and Planning.</p>		
<p>9. The project applicant shall prepare an erosion control plan prepared by a registered engineer that meets both the LUO Section 22.05.034 requirements and requirements of CCRWQCB Order No. 94-80. Since the proposed project would disturb an area greater than one acre, the erosion control plan must be part of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan as required for compliance with NPDES Storm Water Discharge General permits. The erosion control must be reviewed and approved by the County Planning and Building Department. The erosion control plan should include but not be limited to the following best management practices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Temporary mulching, seeding or other suitable stabilization measures to protect exposed erodible areas during construction; b. Earth or paved interceptors and diversions installed at the top of cut or fill slopes where there is a potential for 	<p>Plan to be reviewed and approved prior to the occurrence of the first of the following activities:(a) earth disturbance outside the 45.4 acre area of "Ongoing Waste Disposal and Recycling Operations" as shown on Exhibit A; (b) placement of liner outside the area of "Ongoing Waste Disposal and Recycling Operations" as shown on Exhibit A; or (c) placement of waste material outside approved Modules 1 through 4. The only exceptions to the above are grading for agricultural operations allowed by the County Grading Ordinance, grading required for the acquisition of daily cover for waste burial in Modules 1 through 4, or waste to be buried within approximately one acre of Module 7 adjacent to the boundary of Module 4 which lies within the Area of Ongoing Operations as shown on Exhibit A. The applicant shall provide an annual estimate of the anticipated location and volume of grading to occur under the exceptions. Grading activities shall be subject to monthly monitoring funded by the applicant. The applicant shall also provide records that indicate the location and volume of grading that has occurred under these exceptions in prior years in order to assist this monitoring.</p>	<p>County Planning and Building Department</p>

Mitigation Measure	Timing	Responsible Party
<p>erose surface runoff;</p> <p>Erosion and sediment control devices for all grading and filling. Control devices and measures could include, but are not limited to energy absorbing structures or devices to reduce the velocity of runoff water;</p> <p>Within thirty days after completion of grading, all surfaces disturbed by vegetation removal, grading, haul roads, or other construction activity that alters natural vegetative cover, should be revegetated to control erosion, unless covered with impervious or other improved surfaces authorized by approved plans. Erosion controls may include any combination of mechanical or vegetative measure, including but not limited to those described in USDA Soil Conservation Service Bulletin 347; and</p> <p>Grading operations shall be conducted to prevent damaging effects of erosion, sediment production and dust on the site and on adjoining properties.</p>	<p>On-going monitoring for mitigation implementation is required through the duration of project operations.</p>	
<p>The applicant shall prepare an erosion control plan to be implemented at the proposed ridge fill locations. The plan must be consistent with the related Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan standards contained in the LUO. The plan must be coordinated with ridge fill related mitigation</p>	<p>Plan to be reviewed and approved prior to the occurrence of the first of the following activities: (a) earth disturbance outside the 45.4 acre area of "Ongoing Waste Disposal and Recycling Operations" as shown on Exhibit A; (b) placement of liner outside the area of "Ongoing Waste Disposal and Recycling Operations" as shown on Exhibit A; or (c) placement of waste material</p>	<p>County Planning and Building Department</p>

5-91

Mitigation Measure	Timing	Responsible Party
<p>in Sections 2.1, Aesthetics and 2.3, Biological Resources.</p> <p>The erosion control plan shall include, but not be limited to, the following measures:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Indigenous or site adapted species shall be used for revegetation to increase the probability for success; Seedbeds shall be prepared to control unwanted vegetation and provide rapid infiltration (e.g., loose, irregular surface); Any broadcast seeds shall be planted at an appropriate depth to ensure their success. Larger seeds shall be planted deeper, smaller seeds shallower; Revegetation and/or seeding shall occur when moisture and temperature conditions are most favorable to provide the longest possible period for germination and early growth; Seedlings shall be protected from grazing for at least two growing seasons; Contour furrows or trenches shall be constructed to break slope length and provide depression storage for surface runoff, and hold water in place until it infiltrates the soil to assist with vegetation establishment. Pitting may also be used to create depressions for establishing clustered vegetation; and, 	<p>outside approved Modules 1 through 4. The only exceptions to the above are grading for agricultural operations allowed by the County Grading Ordinance, grading required for the acquisition of daily cover for waste burial in Modules 1 through 4, or waste to be buried within approximately one acre of Module 7 adjacent to the boundary of Module 4 which lies within the Area of Ongoing Operations as shown on Exhibit A. The applicant shall provide an annual estimate of the anticipated location and volume of grading to occur under the exceptions. Grading activities shall be subject to monthly monitoring funded by the applicant. The applicant shall also provide records that indicate the location and volume of grading that has occurred under these exceptions in prior years in order to assist this monitoring.</p> <p>On-going monitoring for mitigation implementation is required through the duration of project operations.</p>	

5-92

Mitigation Measure	Timing	Responsible Party
<p>g. Any channelization that occurs due to surface waters cutting vertical paths into the slope shall be repaired to prevent gullies and further severe erosion.</p> <p>The plan shall be subject to review and approval of the County Planning and Building Department.</p>		
<p>11. To reduce potential noise impacts on off-site residences located north and east of the expansion area, the applicant shall implement one of the two options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. limit the hours of operation for material recycling grinding equipment to the daytime hours of 7 a.m. to 10 p.m.; or b. place fill in the low points of surrounding ridges as proposed by the applicant. Fill must be placed before the elevation of waste within the expansion area reaches 1,250 feet. 	<p>The change in operating hours, if selected as the mitigation option, shall be included as a condition of approval of the Land Use Permit and reflected in all regulatory documents prepared pursuant to CIWMB and/or CCRWQCB requirements. If the fill option is selected, fill must be placed before the elevation of waste within the expansion area reaches 1,250 feet.</p>	<p>County Planning and Building Department County Department of Public Works CIWMB/CCRWQCB</p>
<p>12. The applicant shall prepare a fire safety plan consistent with LUO Section 22.05.082. The plan must be reviewed and approved by the CDF.</p>	<p>Plan is subject to review and approval prior to the occurrence of the first of the following activities: (a) earth disturbance outside the 45.4 acre area of "Ongoing Waste Disposal and Recycling Operations" as shown on Exhibit A; (b) placement of liner outside the area of "Ongoing Waste Disposal and Recycling Operations" as shown on Exhibit A; or (c) placement of waste material outside approved Modules 1 through 4. The only exceptions to the above are grading for agricultural operations allowed by the County Grading Ordinance, grading required for the acquisition of daily cover for</p>	<p>County Department of Planning and Building CDF</p>

Mitigation Measure	Timing	Responsible Party
	<p>waste burial in Modules 1 through 4, or waste to be buried within approximately one acre of Module 7 adjacent to the boundary of Module 4 which lies within the Area of Ongoing Operations as shown on Exhibit A. The applicant shall provide an annual estimate of the anticipated location and volume of grading to occur under the exceptions. Grading activities shall be subject to monthly monitoring funded by the applicant. The applicant shall also provide records that indicate the location and volume of grading that has occurred under these exceptions in prior years in order to assist this monitoring.</p>	
<p>13. The applicant shall prepare and implement a litter control plan, which reduces littering of local roadways resulting from transport of uncovered loads to the landfill and litter blowing off the landfill site. The plan shall include, but not be limited to the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Issue a written "one-time" warning to the driver of any vehicle with an uncovered load; b. Issue a fine or increased rate to any driver that enters the facility with an uncovered load after the "one-time" warning has been issued; c. Issue a monthly report to the San Luis Obispo County Public Works Director of all loads that are not covered. The report should include the license number, make & model of vehicle, and the driver's license number; 	<p>Plan is subject to review and approval prior to the occurrence of the first of the following activities: (a) earth disturbance outside the 45.4 acre area of "Ongoing Waste Disposal and Recycling Operations" as shown on Exhibit A; (b) placement of liner outside the area of "Ongoing Waste Disposal and Recycling Operations" as shown on Exhibit A; or (c) placement of waste material outside approved Modules 1 through 4. The only exceptions to the above are grading for agricultural operations allowed by the County Grading Ordinance, grading required for the acquisition of daily cover for waste burial in Modules 1 through 4, or waste to be buried within approximately one acre of Module 7 adjacent to the boundary of Module 4 which lies within the Area of Ongoing Operations as shown on Exhibit A. The applicant shall provide an annual estimate of the anticipated location and volume of grading to occur under the exceptions. Grading activities shall be subject to monthly monitoring funded by the applicant. The applicant shall also provide records that indicate the location and volume of grading that has occurred under</p>	<p>County Department of Public Works County Department of Public Health</p>

594

Mitigation Measure	Timing	Responsible Party
<p>d. Post signage at the landfill entrance and/or scale house stating this policy;</p> <p>e. Provide weekly removal of trash and litter on the sections of Homestead Road, South El Pomar Road, and El Pomar Road located within one mile of the landfill boundary, and on the section of Templeton Road located within two miles of the landfill boundary; and</p> <p>f. Provide all residents living within 500 feet of all road segments that located within a 1/4 mile radius of the landfill boundary with a contact number to be determined in consultation with the County Public Works Department or the County Public Health Department, to which complaints can be filed about trash on these roadways.</p> <p>Implementation of the plan shall be monitored though the contact agency noted in item "f" of this mitigation with corrective action to be taken by that agency for violations of the mitigation.</p> <p>The plan must be reviewed and approved by the County Public Works Department and the County Public Health Department.</p>	<p>these exceptions in prior years in order to assist this monitoring.</p> <p>On-going monitoring for mitigation implementation is required through the duration of project operations.</p>	

5-95

Mitigation Measure	Timing	Responsible Party
<p>14. In the event that the current configuration of the landfill entrance does not comply with County requirements as determined by the County Public Works Department, the applicant shall prepare a landfill entrance reconfiguration plan detailing the improvements necessary to address the safety issues at the existing entrance. The improvement plan shall be prepared to County specifications, which include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Driveway shall meet Homestead Road at a 90-degree angle; b. Driveway throat shall extend 50 feet into the site, measured from the edge of Homestead road, before making any turns; c. Driveway corners shall have radii to accommodate California Design Vehicle, with no need to cross into an opposing lane on Homestead Road; d. Driveway location shall comply with County Standard A-11 for sight distance; and e. Driveway construction shall comply with county Standard B-2-2. <p>The plan shall be subject to review and approval by the County Public Works Department.</p>	<p>Improvements as needed to be completed prior to the occurrence of the first of the following activities: (a) earth disturbance outside the 45.4 acre area of "Ongoing Waste Disposal and Recycling Operations" as shown on Exhibit A; (b) placement of liner outside the area of "Ongoing Waste Disposal and Recycling Operations" as shown on Exhibit A; or (c) placement of waste material outside approved Modules 1 through 4. The only exceptions to the above are grading for agricultural operations allowed by the County Grading Ordinance, grading required for the acquisition of daily cover for waste burial in Modules 1 through 4, or waste to be buried within approximately one acre of Module 7 adjacent to the boundary of Module 4 which lies within the Area of Ongoing Operations as shown on Exhibit A. The applicant shall provide an annual estimate of the anticipated location and volume of grading to occur under the exceptions. Grading activities shall be subject to monthly monitoring funded by the applicant. The applicant shall also provide records that indicate the location and volume of grading that has occurred under these exceptions in prior years in order to assist this monitoring.</p>	County Department of Public Works

5-96

Mitigation Measure	Timing	Responsible Party
<p>15. The landowner shall file a notice of partial non-renewal with the County of San Luis Obispo for that portion of the parcel under Williamson Act contract that would be converted from an agricultural use. In addition the landowner shall identify an amount of land equal to that proposed for non-renewal that has been reclaimed to a level deemed acceptable to the County to replace the portion removed from the Williamson Act contract. The replacement land shall be placed under the same Williamson Act contract such that the total land within the existing contract remains constant. No grading or other land disturbance shall be permitted on the land subject to partial non-renewal until the Williamson Act contract is terminated (or approximately 10 years from the date the partial notice of non-renewal is filed with the County). The request for partial non-renewal shall be subject to review and approval by the County Agricultural Preserve Review Committee and the Board of Supervisors.</p>	<p>The portion of the landfill property subject to non-renewal must be removed from the Williamson Act contract prior to the occurrence of the first of the following activities: (a) earth disturbance outside the 45.4 acre area of "Ongoing Waste Disposal and Recycling Operations" as shown on Exhibit A; (b) placement of liner outside the area of "Ongoing Waste Disposal and Recycling Operations" as shown on Exhibit A; or (c) placement of waste material outside approved Modules 1 through 4. The only exceptions to the above are grading for agricultural operations allowed by the County Grading Ordinance, grading required for the acquisition of daily cover for waste burial in Modules 1 through 4, or waste to be buried within approximately one acre of Module 7 adjacent to the boundary of Module 4 which lies within the Area of Ongoing Operations as shown on Exhibit A. The applicant shall provide an annual estimate of the anticipated location and volume of grading to occur under the exceptions. Grading activities shall be subject to monthly monitoring funded by the applicant. The applicant shall also provide records that indicate the location and volume of grading that has occurred under these exceptions in prior years in order to assist this monitoring.</p>	<p>County Department of Planning and Building CIWMB</p>